

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the non-final Office action mailed June 30, 2004. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending. Applicants have added new claim 17, which contains similar subject matter as Applicants' original claim 1. No new matter is being added.

At paragraph 1 in the Office action, the drawings were objected to because it was argued that it was hard to follow the arrows in Applicants' informal Figs. 27-30.

In response, Applicants submit a formal set of drawings herewith, where the arrows in Figs. 27-30 are more well-defined and are depicted in bold type. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the drawings should be removed.

At paragraph 2 in the Office action, claims 1-16 were objected to because independent claim 1 required clarification of the disengaged state of the locking mechanism, and dependent claim 5 contained an improper antecedent reference.

As per claim 1, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to explicitly state that when the locking mechanism is disengaged, the upper member is no longer secured by the locking mechanism. The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, clarifies the disengaged state of the locking mechanism, thereby obviating the pending claim objection.

As per claim 5, the Applicants respectfully note that the objected to antecedent reference in claim 5, line 5 (which does not exist) actually appears to be located in claim 3, line 5. For this reason, the Applicants have amended claim 3, line 5 to recite “the position,” as requested in the Office action. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claim 5 should be removed.

Here, it is noted that the Applicants’ amendments to claims 1 and 3 were made in response to issues unrelated to patentability, i.e., for clarification purposes and for correcting antecedent references. Accordingly, the amendments made herein do not narrow the scope of the Applicants’ originally presented claims.

In paragraphs 3-5 in the Office action, claims 1-16 were identified as being allowable if the pending claim objections are overcome. As noted above, the claim objections have been corrected, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 are currently allowable. Further, new claim 17 comprises the same or similar allowable subject matter as independent claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

All pending claims in their present form are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

PATENTS
133004-0008P2

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen E. Kabakoff
Reg. No. 51,276
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500